arXiv:1606.08182v1 [astro-ph.SR] 27 Jun 2016

Photocentric orbits from a direct combination of ground-based astrometry with Hipparcos II. Preliminary orbits for 6 astrometric binaries

G. A. Gontcharov*, O. V. Kiyaeva

June 28, 2016

Pulkovo observatory, Saint-Petersburg, 196140, Russia

Key words: stars: individual (iota Vir, zeta UMa, gamma UMa, kappa Del, 20 Oph, mu Ser)

Based on a direct combination of the Hipparcos data with astrometric ground-based observational catalogues having epochs between 1938 and 1999 the preliminary orbits and component masses are calculated for 6 binaries with no previous orbit calculation: ι Vir (HIP 69701) with period of 55 years, photocentric semi-major axis of 200 mas, relative semi-major axis of 830 mas and a dwarf secondary of 0.6 solar masses; γ UMa (HIP 58001) – 20.5 years, 90 mas, 460 mas and a dwarf secondary of 0.8 solar masses; κ Del (HIP 101916) – 45 years, 100 mas, 520 mas and a dwarf secondary of 0.4 solar masses; 20 Oph (HIP 82369) – 35.5 years, 140 mas, 460 mas and a dwarf secondary of 0.8 solar masses; μ Ser (HIP 77516) – 36 years, 110 mas, 350 mas and a secondary of 2.3 solar masses; as well as a possible new component of Mizar A (ζ UMa, HIP 65378) – 36.5 years, 180 mas, 780 mas, 1.5 solar masses. The latter may be a pair of dwarfs.

*E-mail: georgegontcharov@yahoo.com

Introduction

We continue the investigation of astrometric binaries among the fundamental stars presented in the previous paper (Gontcharov and Kiyaeva 2002 – hereafter Paper I). We use the method of a direct combination of the Hipparcos data with astrometric ground-based observational catalogues as described by Gontcharov et al. (2001). Briefly, the parallaxes from the Hipparcos catalogue (ESA 1997 – hereafter HIP) or its new reduction (van Leeuwen 2007 – hereafter HIP2), radial velocities from the Pulkovo Compilation of Radial Velocities (Gontcharov 2006 – hereafter PCRV) as well as positions from the HIP or HIP2 and observational ground-based catalogues were used in order to reduce many observational ground-based catalogues into a common reference frame close to the ICRS/Hipparcos. The results of the reductions are a uniform series of positions of 1535 Basic FK5 stars (Fricke et al. 1988) over several decades (including the photocentric positions from the HIP or HIP2). These series of star positions were used to improve individual proper motions of the stars which were published as The Proper Motions of Fundamental Stars catalogue (PMFS), Part I (Gontcharov et al. 2001) and then slightly revised for some stars with new ground-based and HIP2 data. The motion of many stars appear non-linear. It is separated into linear motion of the barycentre of the stellar pair and elliptical motion of the photocentre around the barycentre. The latter is analyzed here with the aim to calculate orbits and masses of components. The procedure of separation of the non-linear motion into a linear and an elliptic one includes a mutual improvement of the proper motion and orbital elements in iterations as described in Paper I.

Previously we used 57 observational astrometric catalogues listed by Gontcharov et al. (2001). Three ground-based catalogues added for the current investigation are listed in Table 1. Mutual processing of all the 60 catalogues having epochs between 1938 and 1999 leads to a revision of the proper motions of some stars in the PMFS catalogue. The revised PMFS will be discussed elsewhere. In this paper both original and revised proper motions are given.

The comparison of our results with several known orbits and application of the method to the calculation of some new orbits were presented in the Paper I. Preliminary orbits for another six binaries are discussed here.

Table 1: Observational ground-based catalogues used for star positions in addition to the list in Gontcharov et al. (2001)

Abbreviation	Observatory	Telescopes	Reference	Epoch
CDS I-144	Herstmonceux	Cooke Transit Circle	Tucker et al. 1983	1973
W2j00	Washington and New Zealand	6- and 7-inch Transit Circles	Rafferty and Holdenried 2002	1991
HAMC	El Leoncito	San Fernando Automatic MC	HAMC CD 2001	1998

Stars under consideration

The stars are listed in Table 2. The fainter component is unseen in all the cases except μ Ser. The rotational velocities, Teff, Fe/H, ages, masses of the observable components and their precisions are taken from the precise multiband photometry, spectroscopy or interferometry by Nordstrom et al. (2004), Holmberg et al. (2009), Soubiran et al. (2008), Takeda (2007), Feltzing and Gonzalez (2001), Morossi et al. (2002), Abt and Morrell (1995), Hummel et al. (1998), Balachandran (1990), Chereul et al. (1999).

Table 3 gives the components ($\mu_\alpha \cdot \cos\delta$ and μ_δ) of their proper motion taken from the FK5, FK6 (long-term prediction (LTP) by Wielen et al. 1999), HIP, HIP2, PMFS catalogue and its current revision. The PMFS and its revision give the barycentric proper motions. The FK5 and FK6 give the photocentric proper motions based on more than a century of observations. These motions are close to the barycentric ones for many stars. The HIP and HIP2 give the photocentric proper motion of these binaries in the course of the mission. Three years of the mission is much less than orbital periods of these stars. Therefore the HIP/HIP2 photocentric proper motion generally is far from the barycentric one.

In Table 4 we show the semi-major axis of apparent ellipse a_{app}, standard deviation of the astrometric observations from the best orbit along α – σ_α^{min} (in milliarcseconds, hereafter mas), the same along δ – σ_δ^{min}, the same along celestial great circle – $\sigma_{\alpha+\delta}^{min}$, and the signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) calculated as $2a_{app}/\sigma_{\alpha+\delta}^{min}$. The standard deviations give an estimate of the accuracy of the formed series of astrometric observations.

The deviation of the observations from the orbits shows that the used ground-based catalogues can be divided into two groups depending on the accidental accuracy (after the reduction to the ICRS/Hipparcos): the classical catalogues with accuracy of positions near 100÷200 mas and the catalogues

Table 2: Stars under consideration: names and numbers from various catalogues, coordinates, spectrum, visual magnitude, B-V, parallax from HIP and HIP2 with its precision, type of HIP2 component solution, radial velocity with its precision from PCRV and the rest parameters taken from Nordstrom et al. (2004), Holmberg et al. (2009), Soubiran et al. (2008), Takeda (2007), Feltzing and Gonzalez (2001), Morossi et al. (2002), Abt and Morrell (1995), Hummel et al. (1998), Balachandran (1990), Chereul et al. (1999).

	ι Vir	ζ UMa	γ UMa	κ Del	20 Oph	μ Ser
Name		Mizar A	Phecda			
HIP	69701	65378	58001	101916	82369	77516
FK5	525	497	447	772	1438	585
HR	5338	5054	4554	7896	6243	5881
HD	124850	116656	103287	196755	151769	141513
ADS		8891		14101		
$\alpha, \circ$ J2000	214.0036	200.9814	178.4577	309.7824	252.4585	237.4050
$\delta, \circ$ J2000	-6.0005	54.9254	53.6948	10.0862	-10.7830	-3.4302
Spectrum	F7IV-V	A2V+A2V	A0V	G1IV	F7IV	A0V
V mag	4.1	2.2	2.4	5.1	4.6	3.7
B-V	0.52	0.05	0.04	0.68	0.49	-0.02
HIP π, mas	47	42	39	33	27	21
HIP2 π, mas	45.0±0.2	38.0±1.7	39.2±0.4	33.2±0.3	31.3±2.2	19.2±0.4
HIP2 solution	5-parameter	5-parameter	stochastic	5-parameter	stochastic	7-parameter
V_r, km/s	12.4±0.8	-6.9±1.0	-11.9±1.1	-53.5±0.7	-1.6±1.3	-9.4±2.7
$v \sin\, i$, km/s	16	25	165	4	11	85
lg(Teff)	3.79	3.95		3.75	3.80	
Fe/H	-0.31 to -0.01			0.00 to $+0.09$	-0.08 to -0.01	
Age, Gyr	1.9÷2.1	0.3	0.3	2.8÷3.0	1.6÷1.8	
Mass, $M_\odot$	1.5±0.05	4.9±0.1		1.45±0.05	1.72±0.1	

Table 3: The proper motion of the binaries (in mas/yr): from the FK5, FK6 (long-term prediction), HIP, HIP2, PMFS and revised PMFS

Name	FK5		FK6		HIP		HIP2		PMFS		revised PMFS	
	$\mu_\alpha \cdot \cos\delta$	μ_δ	$\mu_\alpha \cdot \cos\delta$	μ_δ	$\mu_\alpha \cdot \cos\delta$	μ_δ	$\mu_\alpha \cdot \cos\delta$	μ_δ	$\mu_\alpha \cdot \cos\delta$	μ_δ	$\mu_\alpha \cdot \cos\delta$	μ_δ
ι Vir	-4	-432	-11	-433	-26	-420	-26	-419	-21	-433	-16	-434
ζ UMa	$+122$	-20			$+121$	-22	$+119$	-26	$+121$	-23	$+118$	-22
γ UMa	$+95$	$+12$	$+95$	$+10$	$+108$	$+11$	$+108$	$+11$	$+96$	$+8$	$+94$	$+8$
κ Del	$+321$	$+22$			$+324$	$+21$	$+324$	$+22$	$+320$	$+22$	$+318$	$+22$
20 Oph	$+96$	-93			$+94$	-82	$+72$	-79	$+95$	-94	$+94$	-92
μ Ser	-86	-24			-98	-27	-100	-26	-88	-27	-89	-25

obtained with the automated photoelectric telescopes of the 1980-90ths such as Carlsberg and Bordeaux meridian circles with accuracy of positions near 30÷50 mas. To calculate the best orbits the positions are weighted according to their conventional accuracy: 100 mas for the classical catalogues, standard deviation from the HIP/HIP2 - for the photoelectric catalogues and 10 mas - for the HIP2 results (except Mizar A for which no Hipparcos position is used). The HIP2 results are presented as three positions for the epochs 1990.25, 1991.25 and 1992.25 calculated from the HIP2 according to usual 5-parameter solutions for ι Vir and κ Del, stochastic solutions for Phecda and 20 Oph and 7-parameter (acceleration) solution for μ Ser.

It is evident from the standard deviation of the observations and the precision of the orbital elements that our orbits must be regarded as preliminary. They are meant to provide a baseline for future observations and orbit calculations.

In order to evaluate the precision of the orbits a dense set of the orbits is calculated for the 7-dimension space determined by the orbital elements. The precision of every orbital element is calculated as the dispersion of the element for all the orbits with $\sigma_{\alpha+\delta} < \sigma^{min}_{\alpha+\delta} + \sigma^{min}_{\alpha+\delta}/N^{1/2}$, where N is the number of used catalogues.

The self-consistent sets of orbital elements with their precision as well as other parameters of the binaries are presented in Table 5. To obtain the sets we used the following common relations as mentioned in Paper I. The orbital elements P, T, i, e and Ω are the same for the relative (secondary with respect to primary) and photocentric (photocentre with respect to barycentre) orbits; ω differs by 180°. The ratio of the distance 'barycentre – primary' to 'secondary – primary' is $B = M_B/(M_A + M_B)$, where M_A and M_B are the component masses; the ratio of the distance 'photocentre – primary' to 'B–A' is $\beta = 1/(1 + 10^{0.4\Delta m})$, where Δm is the magnitude difference. Thus, $a_{pm} = a_{BA} \cdot (B - \beta)$, where a_{BA} and a_{pm} are the relative and photocentric semi-major axes (both in milliarcseconds (mas) hereafter). For every pair except μ Ser the mass of the primary is approximately estimated from the magnitude, spectrum, color index or other external data. Then the system of 2 equations

$$M_A + M_B = a^3_{BA}/(\pi^3 P^2),\ (\pi\text{=parallax, P=period}),$$
$$a_{pm} = a_{BA} \cdot (M_B/(M_A + M_B) - 1/(1 + 10^{0.4\Delta m}))$$

is solved for M_B and a_{BA}. Hereafter all the masses are given in solar masses. The speckle-interferometric observations of the secondary of μ Ser allow us

Table 4: The semi-major axis of apparent ellipse a_{app}, standard deviation of the astrometric observations from the best orbit along α – σ_α^{min} (in mas), the same along δ – σ_δ^{min}, the same along celestial great circle – $\sigma_{\alpha+\delta}^{min}$, and the signal-to-noise ratio (S/N)

Name	a_{app}	σ_α^{min}	σ_δ^{min}	$\sigma_{\alpha+\delta}^{min}$	S/N
ι Vir	200	42	51	70	5.7
ζ UMa	180	34	56	68	5.3
γ UMa	90	19	23	33	5.5
κ Del	100	31	30	49	4.1
20 Oph	140	39	29	52	5.4
μ Ser	100	37	29	51	3.9

to calculate a_{BA} and solve these equations for M_A and M_B.

The precisions of the orbital elements, parallax, M_A and Δm determine the ones of the derived parameters. Both the accepted and derived precisions are indicated in Table 5, except some parameters of Phecda because of the uncertainty of its mass.

Our observational material together with the photocentric orbits is shown in Fig. 1–6, each of which is composed of three subfigures. The first subfigure shows the observations together with the orbit in the form of the offsets $\Delta\delta$ versus $\Delta\alpha\cos\delta$ given in arcsec. The Hipparcos position matches the calculated orbit quite well. The barycentre is marked by a cross. The observations are connected by O-C (observed - calculated) lines to the appropriate epochs on the orbital ellipses. The second and third subfigures give the offsets $\Delta\alpha\cos\delta$ and $\Delta\delta$, respectively, as a function of time. The figures are not ideal representations of our results because a) the astrometric catalogues have different accuracies and respective weights in our processing and b) some astrometric catalogues containing only α or δ are not presented in the subfigure '$\Delta\delta$ versus $\Delta\alpha\cos\delta$'.

Table 5: Self-consistent sets of some parameters of the binaries: 7 rows of assumed (in italic) and derived orbital elements with precision followed by the rows of other parameters where parallax, Δm, as well as mass (except μ Ser), spectrum and V magnitude of the primary are accepted.

Parameter	ι Vir	ζ UMa	γ UMa	κ Del	20 Oph	μ Ser
a_{pm}, mas	200±50	180±20	90±10	100±30	140±50	110±10
P, years	*55*	36.5±2	20.5±1	45±5	35.5±1.5	36±2
T, year	1950.7±2.7	1994.8±1	1984.0±2.0	1971.2±1.8	1981.2±1.7	1988.9±1.8
Ω,°	3±20	32±10	6±61	326±17	118±9	296±28
ω,°	336±27	287±14	185±37	8±34	34±26	308±32
e	0.1±0.2	0.6±0.2	0.3±0.3	0.8±0.4	0.8±0.2	0.4±0.3
i, °	60±9	93±7	51±15	107±18	74±11	103±28
a_{BA}, mas	830±20	780±30	460	520±30	460±30	350±10
parallax, mas	*45±0.2*	*38±2*	*39.2±0.4*	*33.2±0.3*	*31±2*	*19.2±0.4*
$\sum M, M_\odot$	2.1±0.2	6.4 ± 0.4	3.9	1.85 ± 0.2	2.5 ± 0.2	4.7 ± 0.7
mass of primary, $M_\odot$	*1.5±0.05*	*4.9±0.1*	*3.1*	*1.45±0.05*	*1.72±0.1*	2.4 ± 0.4
mass of secondary, $M_\odot$	0.6 ± 0.2	1.5 ± 0.4	0.8	0.4 ± 0.2	0.8±0.2	2.3 ± 0.4
B	0.28 ± 0.08	0.23 ± 0.1	0.21	0.22 ± 0.07	0.32±0.1	0.49 ± 0.03
Δm	$>4^m$	$>4^m$	$>4^m$	$>4^m$	$>4^m$	$1.64^m \pm 0.05^m$
β	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	0.18 ± 0.01
$B - \beta$	0.28 ± 0.08	0.23 ± 0.1	0.21	0.22 ± 0.07	0.32±0.1	0.31 ± 0.03
Spectrum of primary	F7IV-V	A2V+A2V	A0V	G5IV	F7IV	A0V
Spectrum of secondary	WD or RD	pair of dwarfs	WD or RD	WD or RD	WD or RD	
V mag of primary	4.1^m	2.2^m	2.4^m	5.1^m	4.6^m	3.7^m
V mag of secondary	$> 8^m$	$> 6^m$	$> 6^m$	$> 9^m$	$> 8^m$	5.3^m
M_V of primary	2.4^m	0.1^m	0.4^m	2.7^m	2.0^m	0.3^m
M_V of secondary	$> 6.4^m$	$> 4^m$	$> 5^m$	$> 6^m$	$> 6^m$	1.9^m

Comments on individual stars

ι Vir

This star was noted by Morrison et al. (1990) as an outlier in the comparison of Carlsberg and Bordeaux meridian circle results with the FK5 prediction. It was also considered by Wielen et al. (1999) as an example for a long-period astrometric binary. Based on a comparison of Hipparcos and ground-based proper motions by the $\Delta\mu$ method they proposed a plausible individual solution: $P \approx 200$ years, $e \approx 0.5$, masses of 1.64 and 0.55, $\Delta m \approx 6.9^m$, $a_{BA} \approx 1865$ mas, $a_{pm} \approx 466$ mas and the proper motion listed in the FK6. This prediction appears to fit rather well as seen from our orbital solution presented in Table 5 and Fig. 1. Inclusion of observations from these many catalogues improves the orbital fit.

The discrepancies between rather young age, low metallicity and considerable velocity (about 48 km/s with respect to the Sun) do not allow us to establish the status of this star. The hidden component of 0.6 solar masses fits a main-sequence star or a white dwarf.

ζ UMa (Mizar)

Hereafter the components of the stellar systems are designated following Washington Multiplicity Catalog nomenclature rules (Mason et al., 2001).

This is a known quadruple system: the pairs Aa-Ab and Ba-Bb are divided by 14 arcsec and move linearly one with respect to other by about 1 arcsec per latest 250 years according to Washington Double Star Catalog (WDS, Mason et al., 2001). The known orbital motions in the close pairs are too short-period and low-amplitude to be detected by ground-based astrometry, except by interferometry, such as by Hummel et al. (1998). The periods are 0.056 and 0.481 years and the relative semi-major axes are 10 and 33 mas. Thus, we are inclined to believe that the observed non-linear motion of the photocentre of the pair Aa-Ab is due to a new unseen component. It should be designated as Mizar Aa1. It would cause variations of the 14-arcsec distance with an amplitude about 180 mas. But the 250-years-long series of the relative observations of Ba-Bb w.r.t. Aa-Ab has been too noisy to detect such variations. This series should continue.

The Hipparcos observations seem to be highly disturbed by the multiplicity: 13% of data were rejected and the HIP Intermediate Astrometry still

remains significantly scattered. Therefore, although the mean position from HIP is in good agreement with the ground-based results it is not used in our processing.

The used observations and obtained results are presented in Table 5 and Fig. 2 where 'primary' and 'secondary' designate the observed close pair Aa-Ab and the new unseen component, respectively. Edge-on orientation of the orbit means that the observable photocentre moves almost linearly. Some systematic errors and mistakes of ground-based astrometry can produce such an effect. Thus, the new component is questionable. On the other hand, some elements of our orbit presented in Table 5 are similar to the ones of the known close pair Aa-Ab: ω is 287° versus 284°, eccentricity is 0.6 versus 0.54, but inclination is 93° versus 60.5°, Ω is 32° versus 106°.

The total mass of the close pair Aa-Ab is well determined by Hummel et al. (1998): 4.9 ± 0.1 solar masses. This helps to estimate the mass of the new component: a pair of dwarfs fits best.

γ UMa (Phecda)

Spectroscopic duplicity of this star mentioned in some catalogues seems to be a mistake: it could not been detected because of a large rotational velocity. No component closer than 40 mas was detected in 2 speckle-interferometric observations mentioned in the Fourth Catalog of Interferometric Measurements of Binary Stars by Hartkopf et al. (2009) (hereafter – the Fourth Catalog). This star was detected as an astrometric ($\Delta\mu$) binary in a comparison of Hipparcos and ground-based proper motions by Wielen et al. (1999). As ι Vir mentioned above a plausible individual solution was proposed by them: $P \approx 30$ years, $e \approx 0.5$, masses of 3.07 and 0.53, $\Delta m \approx 9.4^m$, $a_{BA} \approx 518$ mas, $a_{pm} \approx 760$ mas and the proper motion listed in the FK6. This prediction appears quite reliable as seen from our solution presented in Table 5 and Fig. 3. A red or white dwarf fits the parameters best. It should be noted that this orbit fits the astrometric observations best.

κ Del

This star is mentioned as G5IV+ in HIP and other catalogues. There is a K2IV component of 12^m changing its separation from 10 arcsec in 1851 to 45 arcsec in 2000 (Mason et al., 2001). This star is too faint to be a physical

component. This and a common proper motion component at 216 arcsec (6500 AU) could not influence astrometric observations.

The Fe/H estimations by Feltzing and Gonzalez (2001), Nordstrom et al. (2004), Holmberg et al. (2009), Takeda (2007) and Soubiran et al. (2008) are slightly discrepant although they rule out a previously declared very high metallicity status of this star.

As for ι Vir some discrepancy between rather young age and high metallicity on the one hand and high velocity on the other make the status of the star uncertain. It could have acquired the high velocity during the formation of the hidden companion, if this star is a white dwarf. Else it is just a low-mass main-sequence star.

The orbit is shown in Fig. 4. Periastron passage is expected within a few years after 2011.

20 Oph

Abt and Levy (1976) calculated a spectroscopic orbit with a period of about 3.5 years. The data used by them look insufficient to calculate a reliable orbit as pointed out by Morbey and Griffin (1987). The unseen secondary has never been detected in many speckle-interferometric observations listed in the Fourth Catalog. The orbit is shown in Fig. 5.

The HIP gives an acceleration solution whereas HIP2 gives a stochastic solution and quite a different parallax which fits the spectrum, magnitude and $B-V$ better. Low metallicity contradicts a young age of this star.

μ Ser

For this star HIP and HIP2 give an acceleration solution shown as 3 open diamonds near our orbital ellipse in Fig. 6. Fabricius and Makarov (2000) revised the Hipparcos observations of this star and obtained a component solution. Its parallax and Δm are accepted by us (see Table 5). Also, there are five speckle-interferometric observations of this pair made in 1995-1999 and listed in the Fourth Catalog together with the revised Hipparcos position. The results of these six observations are shown in Fig. 6 as light asterisks. The speckle-interferometric observations are used together with our observational material to obtain a better orbit. As a result it is found that the speckle-interferometric observations fit our a_{pm} when $a_{BA} = 350$ mas and $B-\beta = 0.31$. Thus, for this pair both the masses are calculated. The low precision of

the mass determination may explain the discrepancy between similar masses but different luminosities. The same does not allow us to establish the status of the secondary. It may be a A or F dwarf, subgiant, giant or even a pair of late-type dwarfs.

Conclusions

We hope that our preliminary orbits may help guide the observations so that someone may resolve the unseen components of five of the binaries and highlight the need for the continual monitoring of the other. Some unusual properties of the systems such as discrepancies between age, metallicity and velocity may relate to the presence of the unseen components.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Dr. Roger Griffin for providing comments on some binaries, to Dr. Leslie Morrison for providing comments to the Carlsberg meridian telescope results, to Dr. Brian Mason for various assistance and also to anonymous reviewer for usefull comments.

This research has made use of the Centre de Données astronomiques de Strasbourg (CDS), Astronomical Data Center (ADC) at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, SIMBAD astronomical database and the Washington Double Star Catalog maintained at the U.S. Naval Observatory.

This work was supported by the Russian foundation for basic research, RFBR, projects #08–02–00400, #09–02–00267.

References

1. Abt, H.A., Levy, S.G., 1976, ApJS, 30, 273.

2. Abt, H.A., Morrell, N.I., 1995, ApJS, 99, 135.

3. Balachandran, S., 1990, ApJ, 354, 310.

4. Chereul, E., Creze, M., Bienayme, O., 1999, A&AS, 135, 5.

5. ESA, 1997, The Hipparcos and Tycho Catalogues, ESA SP-1200.

6. Fabricius, C., Makarov, V.V., 2000, A&AS, 144, 45.

7. Feltzing, S., Gonzalez, G., 2001, A&A, 367, 253.

8. Fricke, W., Schwan, H., Lederle, T., et al., 1988, Veröff. Astron. Rechen-Institut Heidelberg, 32.

9. Gontcharov, G.A., Andronova, A.A., Titov, O.A., Kornilov, E.V., 2001, A&A, 365, 222.

10. Gontcharov, G.A., Kiyaeva, O.V., 2002, A&A, 391, 647.

11. Gontcharov, G.A., 2006, Astronomy Letters, 32, 759.

12. Hartkopf, W.I., Mason, B.D., Wycoff, G.L., et al., Fourth Catalog of Interferometric Measurements of Binary Stars, 2009, URL: http://ad.usno.navy.mil/wds/int4.html

13. Hispano-Argentinian Meridian Catalogue (HAMC), 2001, Real Inst. y Obs. de la Armada en San Fernando, Observatorio Astronomico Felix Aguilar.

14. Holmberg, J., Nordstrom, B., Andersen, J., 2009, A&A, 501, 941.

15. Hummel, C.A., Mozurkewich, D., Armstrong, J.T., et al., 1998, AJ, 116, 2536.

16. van Leeuwen F., 2007, A&A, 474, 653.

17. Mason, B., Wycoff, G.L., Hartkopf, W.I., 2001, AJ, 122, 3466, http://www.usno.navy.mil, http://www.usno.navy.mil/USNO/astrometry/optical-IR-prod/wds/wmc

18. Morbey, C.L., Griffin, R.F., 1987, ApJ, 317, 343.

19. Morossi, C., Di Marcantonio, P., Franchini, M., et al., 2002, ApJ, 577, 377.

20. Morrison, L.V., Argyle, R.W., Requieme, Y., et al., 1990, A&A, 240, 173.

21. Nordstrom, B., Mayor, M., Andersen, J., et al., 2004, A&A, 418, 989.

22. Rafferty, T.J., Holdenried, E.R., 2002, The W2j00 catalog, USNO, http://ad.usno.navy.mil/proj/W2J00/

23. Soubiran, C., Bienayme, O., Mishenina, T.V., et al., 2008, A&A, 480, 91.

24. Takeda, Y., 2007, PASJ, 59, 335.

25. Tucker, R.H., Buontempo, M.E., Gibbs, P., Swifte, R.H.D., 1983, Royal Greenwich Obs. Bull., 189.

26. Wielen, R., Dettbarn, C., Jahreiß, H., et al., 1999, A&A, 346, 675.

27. Wielen, R., Schwan, H., Dettbarn, C., et al., 1999, Veröff. Astron. Rechen-Institut Heidelberg, 35.



Figure 1: Photocentric orbit of ι Vir together with ground-based (filled diamonds) and Hipparcos (3 open diamonds) results



Figure 2: Photocentric orbit of ζ UMa (Mizar) together with ground-based (filled diamonds) and Hipparcos (1 open diamond) results



Figure 3: Photocentric orbit of γ UMa (Phecda) together with ground-based (filled diamonds) and Hipparcos (3 open diamond) results



Figure 4: Photocentric orbit of κ Del together with ground-based (filled diamonds) and Hipparcos (3 open diamond) results



Figure 5: Photocentric orbit of 20 Oph together with ground-based (filled diamonds) and Hipparcos (3 open diamond) results



Figure 6: Photocentric orbit of μ Ser together with ground-based (filled diamonds), Hipparcos acceleration solution (3 open diamond), revised Hipparcos component solution by Fabricius and Makarov (2000) with the assumption $B - \beta = 0.31$ (a separate light asterisk) and the results of speckle-interferometric observations with the assumption $B - \beta = 0.31$ (light asterisks)